

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:                   \$ Group Art Unit: 3623  
     Calderaro, et. al.                   \$ Confirmation No.: 9300  
   \$ Examiner: Choi, Peter H.  
 Serial No.: 09/895,977               \$  
   \$ Attorney Docket No.  
 Filed: June 29, 2001                 \$ AUS920010235US1  
   \$  
 Title: System and Method for       \$ IBM Corporation  
        Organizational Risk Based   \$ Intellectual Property Law  
        On Personnel Planning     \$ Dept.  
        Factors                       \$ 11400 Burnet Road  
   \$ Austin, Texas 78758

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
 Commissioner for Patents  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Certificate of Mailing or Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or electronically transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

/Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/   3/02/2007  
 Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196       Date

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF (37 CFR § 41.37)**

Sir:

**A. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

This brief is filed in support of the previously filed Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on January 16, 2007, which appealed from the decision of the Examiner dated October 16, 2006 finally rejecting claims 1-20. Please charge the required fee under 37 CFR § 41.20(b)(2) to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

The two-month deadline for filing this Appeal Brief is March 16, 2007, therefore, no extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

**B. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest in this appeal is International Business Machines Corporation, which is the assignee of the entire right, title, and interest in the above-identified patent application.

**C. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

With respect to other prior or pending appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings that are related to, will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no such prior or pending appeals, interferences, or judicial proceeding known to Appellants, Appellants' legal representative, or assignee.

**D. STATUS OF CLAIMS***1. Total number of claims in application*

There are 20 claims pending. Three claims are independent claims (1, 8, and 14), and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

*2. Status of all claims in application*

- Claims canceled: None
- Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None
- Claims pending: 1-20
- Claims allowed: None
- Claims rejected: 1-20

*3. Claims on appeal*

The claims on appeal are: 1-20.

**E. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

All amendments have been entered in this case. No amendments have been made to the claims after the Final Office Action dated October 16, 2006.

**F. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Appellants provide a concise summary of the claimed subject matter as follows. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims. Note that claims 1-7 are method claims, claims 8-13 are information handling system claims, and claims 14-20 are computer program product claims. Independent claims 8 and 14 include means plus function limitations that correspond to the method steps set forth in independent claim 1. An information handling system capable of implementing Appellants' invention, as claimed in independent claim 8, is shown in Figures 1 and 20, and described in Appellants' specification on page 14, line 7 through page 17, line 20, and also on page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19. Support for independent computer program product claim 14 is described in Appellants' specification on page 59, line 20 through page 60, line 9. In addition, support for each of the method steps and means plus function limitations of the independent claims are discussed below. The specific citations to Appellants' Figures and Specification are meant to be exemplary in nature, and do not limit the scope of the claims. In particular, the citations below do not limit the scope of equivalents as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

As claimed in independent claim 1, the claimed invention is a computer-implemented method for analyzing attrition risk for employees, including receiving risk planning factor data from a user, the risk planning factor data corresponding to one or more selected employees (see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 315; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2), storing the risk planning factor data in employee profile data areas, wherein each employee profile data area corresponds to one of the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 300; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2; also see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 410; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13), retrieving actual employment data for each of the selected employees in the employee profile data areas (see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 305; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2; also see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 420; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13), and analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees using the risk

planning factor data and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees (see, e.g., Figure 7, reference numerals 705, 750, 760, and 770; page 33, line 16 through page 36, line 11).

As claimed in independent claim 8, the claimed invention is an information handling system (see e.g., Figure 1, page 14, line 7 through page 17, line 20; also see e.g., Figure 20, page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19) including one or more processors (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19), a memory accessible by the processors (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numerals 2010 and 2020; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19), one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessible by the processors (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19), and an attrition risk tool to analyze attrition risk of employees (see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 480; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13), the attrition risk tool including means for receiving risk planning factor data from a user, the risk planning factor data corresponding to one or more selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 315; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2), means for storing the risk planning factor data in employee profile data areas, wherein each employee profile data area corresponds to one of the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 300; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2; also see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 410; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13), means for retrieving actual employment data for each of the selected employees in the employee profile data areas (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 305; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2; also see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 420; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13), and means for analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees using the risk planning factor data and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see, e.g., Figure 7, reference numerals 705, 750, 760, and 770; page 33, line 16 through page 36, line 11).

As claimed in independent claim 14, the claimed invention is a computer program product (see e.g., page 59, line 20 through page 60, line 9) stored in a computer operable media

(see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19) for analyzing employee attrition risk, including means for receiving risk planning factor data from a user, the risk planning factor data corresponding to one or more selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 315; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2), means for storing the risk planning factor data in employee profile data areas, wherein each employee profile data area corresponds to one of the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 300; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2; also see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 410; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13), means for retrieving actual employment data for each of the selected employees in the employee profile data areas (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 305; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2; also see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 420; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13), and means for analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees using the risk planning factor data and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see, e.g., Figure 7, reference numerals 705, 750, 760, and 770; page 33, line 16 through page 36, line 11).

Appellants argue the claims in several groups, and, as required by 37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(v), Appellants provide support from the specification for the means plus function elements of each dependent claim argued separately below.

Claim 9 is argued separately below, as part of a group including claims 2, 9, and 15. Claim 9 includes means for retrieving motivators and inhibitors included with the risk planning factor data corresponding to the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 7, reference numerals 710 and 730; page 33, line 16 through page 36, line 11), means for calculating a flight risk for each of the selected employees based on the motivators and inhibitors, wherein the flight risk is individually calculated for each of the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 7, reference numerals 705, 750, 760, and 770; page 33, line 16 through page 36, line 11), means for retrieving contribution data included

with the actual employment data corresponding to the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 305; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2; also see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 420; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13); and means for assigning a risk quadrant from a plurality of risk quadrants to each of the selected employees based on the flight risk and contribution corresponding to each selected employee (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2000; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 8, reference numerals 830 through 860; page 36, line 12 through page 38, line 25).

Claim 15 is argued separately below, as part of a group including claims 2, 9, and 15. Claim 15 includes means for retrieving motivators and inhibitors included with the risk planning factor data corresponding to the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 7, reference numerals 710 and 730; page 33, line 16 through page 36, line 11), means for calculating a flight risk for each of the selected employees based on the motivators and inhibitors, wherein the flight risk is individually calculated for each of the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 7, reference numerals 705, 750, 760, and 770; page 33, line 16 through page 36, line 11), means for retrieving contribution data included with the actual employment data corresponding to the selected employees (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 3, reference numeral 305; page 21, line 4 through page 26, line 2; also see e.g., Figure 4, reference numeral 420; page 26, line 3 through page 28, line 13); and means for assigning a risk quadrant from a plurality of risk quadrants to each of the selected employees based on the flight risk and contribution corresponding to each selected employee (see e.g., Figure 20, reference numeral 2072; page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 19; also see e.g., Figure 8, reference numerals 830 through 860; page 36, line 12 through page 38, line 25).

**G. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paizis, U.S. Patent No. 6,338,042 (hereinafter Paizis) in view of “The 1999 U.S. National Employee Relationship Benchmark Report” by the Walker Information Global Network (hereinafter Walker).

**H. ARGUMENTS – APPELLANTS’ CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS, AND ARE THEREFORE PATENTABLE, OVER THE ART OF RECORD**

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, and 16-20 Are Not Obvious And  
Are Therefore Patentable Over Paizis in view of Walker

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2143.03.

Appellants teach and claim a method, system, and computer program product for analyzing attrition risks for employees. As shown in detail in Figures 7 and 8 of Appellants’ specification, attrition risk is *determined separately for each employee*. Each individual employee is also assigned to a risk quadrant. Appellants respectfully submit that neither Paizis nor Walker, nor a combination of the two, teach or suggest all the elements of Appellants’ claims.

Using independent claim 1 as an exemplary claim, Appellants teach and claim the following:

- receiving risk planning factor data from a user, the risk planning factor data corresponding to one or more selected employees;
- storing the risk planning factor data in employee profile data areas, wherein each employee profile data area corresponds to one of the selected employees;

- retrieving actual employment data for each of the selected employees in the employee profile data areas; and
- analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees using the risk planning factor data and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees.

Paizis purports to teach a method and apparatus for incorporating competency and contribution measures into pay decisions (see Paizis, Abstract). The Final Office Action notes that Paizis does not focus on the risk of employee attrition (see Final Office Action, page 7, lines 18-19). Rather, Paizis is concerned with ranking employees in order to determine the amount of each employees' pay raise (Paizis, col. 6, line 23 through col. 7, line 40). Appellants teach and claim analyzing attrition risk for employees, which, at some point, may ultimately result in raising an employee's salary, but also involves much more than simply increasing salaries. Paizis does not appear to be concerned with analyzing attrition risk as taught and claimed by Appellants.

The Final Office Action admits that Paizis does not teach "analyzing attrition risk" as taught and claimed by Appellants, and thus uses Walker in further support of the rejection. However, Walker is a national and global report on Employee Loyalty. As stated in Walker:

Conducted by Walker Information and Hudson Institute, the 1999 Employee Relationship Benchmark Report represents the attitudes and experiences of US workers from business, government, and non-profit organizations in conterminous forty-eight states. Participants were full- or part-time workers, at least eighteen years old, and from organizations of at least fifty employees. 2,293 self-administered questionnaires were returned out of 3,075 mailed, for an atypically high response rate of 75%. The sampling plan represented a cross section of industries, and final total results were weighted to be proportionate according to US labor statistics. Survey results were collected in April and May of 1999.

It is clear that Walker is discussing a survey of employee loyalty. The survey results are discussed throughout Walker, as they apply to large groups of employees. On the fourth page of



Walker (in the section titled “Assessing Employee Commitment in Your Organization”), the reference notes “[i]n most cases, you can learn what drives loyalty *across your entire workforce* for less than the cost of replacing a single employee” (emphasis added).

Walker is not concerned with, and does not address the issue of, analyzing attrition risk on an individual basis for individual employees. In particular, Walker does not teach or suggest “*analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees* using the risk planning factor data and the actual employment data, *wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees*,” as taught and claimed by Appellants in independent claims 1, 8, and 14. Walker is concerned with overall statistics pertaining to employee loyalty across large groups of people, and not with analyzing the attrition risk of each individual employee.

The Final Office states that the survey (i.e. Walker) “collects data from employees regarding their loyalty to their employers (i.e., their intent to stay with their employer), thus analyzing attrition risk for each of the survey participants (the “selected” employees)” (see Final Office Action, page 3, lines 1-4). Appellants respectfully disagree. As also noted in the Final Office Action, the individual survey results are “*aggregated together* for presentation in the 1999 Walker report” (Final Office Action, page 2, line 16 through page 3, line 1, emphasis added). Collecting data from large groups of employees, and then aggregating that data for presentation purposes, is not the same as analyzing attrition risk, on an individual basis, for each employee. Analysis involves more than simply collecting large amounts of data.

Appellants also note that the language used in Walker makes it clear that Walker is discussing generalities, not individual employees. For example, in the section titled “Higher employee commitment leads to higher likelihood of positive behaviors,” Walker states that its “model-based survey methodology enables us to make predictions about the future behavior of the employees who responded.” Walker goes on to state that “*[a]bout one in four employees surveyed (24%) are Truly Loyal*” (emphasis added). Walker’s “prediction” about the future behavior of employees is clearly not an individual analysis of attrition risk for a selected employee, rather it is a generalization that *about* one in four employees is truly loyal. Similar language is used throughout Walker, making it very clear that Walker is talking about estimates of employee loyalty, across large groups of employees, in various industries. A survey that tells an employer approximate percentages of employees who may feel a certain way may be useful,

but it does not tell the employer anything about the attrition risk for a particular, individual employee. Walker simply is not concerned with, and does not teach or suggest, “*analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees* using the risk planning factor data and the actual employment data, *wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees,*” as taught and claimed by Appellants in independent claims 1, 8, and 14.

For the reasons set forth above, Appellants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 14, and the claims which depend from them, are patentable over Paizis in view of Walker.

Claims 2, 9, and 15 Are Not Obvious And Are Therefore  
Patentable Over Paizis in view of Walker

Dependent claims 2, 9, and 15 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 14, respectively, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Appellants’ independent claims. Notwithstanding the patentability of claims 2, 9, and 15 based on the above discussion, Appellants note that these claims add additional elements that are not found in either Paizis or Walker. Using claim 2 as an exemplary claim, dependent claims 2, 9, and 15 include the following limitations:

- retrieving motivators and inhibitors included with the risk planning factor data corresponding to the selected employees;
- calculating a flight risk for each of the selected employees based on the motivators and inhibitors, wherein the flight risk is individually calculated for each of the selected employees;
- retrieving contribution data included with the actual employment data corresponding to the selected employees; and
- assigning a risk quadrant from a plurality of risk quadrants to each of the selected employees based on the flight risk and contribution corresponding to each selected employee.

Neither Paizis nor Walker teaches or suggests “calculating a flight risk” for each individual employee. Further, neither Paizis nor Walker teaches or suggests “assigning a risk quadrant” to each employee based on the individually calculated flight risk and contribution

corresponding to the employee. As discussed in detail above, Walker discusses, in general terms and across a large number of employees, the percentage of employees who feel loyal to a company and what percentage of employees are likely to leave a company. However, neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests calculating a flight risk on an individual employee basis, and then using the flight risk for each individual employee, to assign the employee to a risk quadrant. As discussed above, Walker is concerned with estimates of employee loyalty, across large groups of employees, in various industries.

Appellants further note that claims 2, 9, and 15 specifically claim that a flight risk is calculated for each selected employee, “based on the motivators and inhibitors,” i.e. those “motivators and inhibitors included with the risk planning factor data corresponding to the selected employees.” The Final Office Action states “that even though the terms ‘calculating’ and ‘calculated’ exist in the claim language, there is no evidence that anything is actually ‘calculated’ . . . therefore, this limitation has been taken at its broadest reasonable interpretation, and has been regarded as being analogous to an evaluation of flight risk” (Final Office Action, page 3, lines 10-15). While Appellants agree that claim terms should be given their broadest possible meaning, this does not mean that the Examiner is free to substitute one term for another. The words “calculating” and “calculated” are the words used in the claims, and, as clearly stated in MPEP § 2143.03 “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Appellants use of the words “calculating” and “calculated” is fully support in Appellants’ specification (see, e.g., Figure 7 and page 35, line 17 through page 36, line 3).

While the cited references may discuss motivators and inhibitors in general terms, neither Paizis nor Walker discloses *retrieving* motivators and inhibitors *included with risk planning factor data* for a particular employee, and then *using* those motivators and inhibitors to *calculate* a flight risk for that particular employee, as taught and claimed by Appellants. Walker is a simple survey that asks employees to answer general questions regarding their loyalty to their employer. Walker does not perform any type of calculation using motivators and inhibitors, and certainly does not calculate a flight risk for an individual employee using motivators and inhibitors included as part of risk planning factor data for that particular employee, as taught and claimed by Appellants. Even assuming, for the sake of argument (and Appellants do not agree

with this assumption), that “evaluating” is analogous to “calculating” (as asserted in the Final Office Action on page 3, lines 10-15), neither Walker nor Paizis performs any type of “evaluating” of flight risk for individual employees. Walker simply asks employees how likely they are to stay with their current employer. There is no calculating, nor is there any evaluating, especially not on an individual employee basis.

For the reasons set forth above, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 2, 9, and 15 are patentable over Paizis in view of Walker.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, Appellants submits that claims 1-20 are allowable over Paizis in view of Walker. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the Examiner’s claim rejections be reversed and claims 1-20 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/  
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196  
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen  
Attorneys for Appellants  
Telephone: (512) 301-6738  
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742

**I. CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. A computer-implemented method for analyzing attrition risk for employees, said method comprising:  
receiving risk planning factor data from a user, the risk planning factor data  
corresponding to one or more selected employees;  
storing the risk planning factor data in employee profile data areas, wherein each  
employee profile data area corresponds to one of the selected employees;  
retrieving actual employment data for each of the selected employees in the employee  
profile data areas; and  
analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees using the risk planning factor  
data and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually  
analyzed for each of the selected employees.
2. The computer-implemented method as described in claim 1 further comprising:  
retrieving motivators and inhibitors included with the risk planning factor data  
corresponding to the selected employees;  
calculating a flight risk for each of the selected employees based on the motivators and  
inhibitors, wherein the flight risk is individually calculated for each of the  
selected employees;  
retrieving contribution data included with the actual employment data corresponding to  
the selected employees; and  
assigning a risk quadrant from a plurality of risk quadrants to each of the selected  
employees based on the flight risk and contribution corresponding to each  
selected employee.
3. The computer-implemented method as described in claim 2 further comprising:  
displaying a summary corresponding to each risk quadrant.
4. The computer-implemented method as described in claim 3 further comprising:  
displaying a plurality of groupings;

receiving a risk quadrant selection and a grouping selection from the user;  
summarizing employee profile data assigned to the selected risk quadrant using the  
selected grouping creating a second summary; and  
displaying the second summary.

5. The computer-implemented method as described in claim 3 further comprising:  
selecting one of the risk quadrants;  
determining whether incentives are desired for one or more of the selected employees in  
the selected risk quadrant; and  
modifying incentive data included in employee profile data areas corresponding to the  
one or more selected employees.
6. The computer-implemented method as described in claim 5 further comprising:  
reassigning the risk quadrants for the one or more selected employees in response to the  
modified incentive data; and  
displaying a second summary corresponding to each risk quadrant.
7. The computer-implemented method as described in claim 1 further comprising:  
identifying one or more of the selected employees with a high contribution level and a  
high attrition risk;  
displaying the identified employees to the user;  
determining whether to provide incentives to one or more of the identified employees;  
and  
revising incentive planning data corresponding to one or more of the identified  
employees in response to the determination.
8. An information handling system comprising:  
one or more processors;  
a memory accessible by the processors;  
one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessible by the processors; and  
an attrition risk tool to analyze attrition risk of employees, the attrition risk tool  
including:

means for receiving risk planning factor data from a user, the risk planning factor data corresponding to one or more selected employees;

means for storing the risk planning factor data in employee profile data areas, wherein each employee profile data area corresponds to one of the selected employees;

means for retrieving actual employment data for each of the selected employees in the employee profile data areas; and

means for analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees using the risk planning factor data and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees.

9. The information handling system as described in claim 8 further comprising:
  - means for retrieving motivators and inhibitors included with the risk planning factor data corresponding to the selected employees;
  - means for calculating a flight risk for each of the selected employees based on the motivators and inhibitors, wherein the flight risk is individually calculated for each of the selected employees;
  - means for retrieving contribution data included with the actual employment data corresponding to the selected employees; and
  - means for assigning a risk quadrant from a plurality of risk quadrants to each of the selected employees based on the flight risk and contribution corresponding to each selected employee.
10. The information handling system as described in claim 9 further comprising:
  - means for displaying a summary corresponding to each risk quadrant.
11. The information handling system as described in claim 10 further comprising:
  - means for displaying a plurality of groupings;
  - means for receiving a risk quadrant selection and a grouping selection from the user;
  - means for summarizing employee profile data assigned to the selected risk quadrant using the selected grouping creating a second summary; and
  - means for displaying the second summary.

12. The information handling system as described in claim 10 further comprising:  
means for selecting one of the risk quadrants;  
means for determining whether incentives are desired for one or more of the selected employees in the selected risk quadrant; and  
means for modifying incentive data included in employee profile data areas corresponding to the one or more selected employees.
13. The information handling system as described in claim 8 further comprising:  
means for identifying one or more of the selected employees with a high contribution level and a high attrition risk;  
means for displaying the identified employees to the user;  
means for determining whether to provide incentives to one or more of the identified employees; and  
means for revising incentive planning data corresponding to one or more of the identified employees in response to the determination.
14. A computer program product stored in a computer operable media for analyzing employee attrition risk, said computer program product comprising:  
means for receiving risk planning factor data from a user, the risk planning factor data corresponding to one or more selected employees;  
means for storing the risk planning factor data in employee profile data areas, wherein each employee profile data area corresponds to one of the selected employees;  
means for retrieving actual employment data for each of the selected employees in the employee profile data areas; and  
means for analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees using the risk planning factor data and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees.
15. The computer program product as described in claim 14 further comprising:  
means for retrieving motivators and inhibitors included with the risk planning factor data corresponding to the selected employees;



means for calculating a flight risk for each of the selected employees based on the motivators and inhibitors, wherein the flight risk is individually calculated for each of the selected employees;

means for retrieving contribution data included with the actual employment data corresponding to the selected employees; and

means for assigning a risk quadrant from a plurality of risk quadrants to each of the selected employees based on the flight risk and contribution corresponding to each selected employee.

16. The computer program product as described in claim 15 further comprising:  
means for displaying a summary corresponding to each risk quadrant.
17. The computer program product as described in claim 16 further comprising:  
means for displaying a plurality of groupings;  
means for receiving a risk quadrant selection and a grouping selection from the user;  
means for summarizing employee profile data assigned to the selected risk quadrant using the selected grouping creating a second summary; and  
means for displaying the second summary.
18. The computer program product as described in claim 16 further comprising:  
means for selecting one of the risk quadrants;  
means for determining whether incentives are desired for one or more of the selected employees in the selected risk quadrant; and  
means for modifying incentive data included in employee profile data areas corresponding to the one or more selected employees.
19. The computer program product as described in claim 18 further comprising:  
means for reassigning the risk quadrants for the one or more selected employees in response to the modified incentive data; and  
means for displaying a second summary corresponding to each risk quadrant.
20. The computer program product as described in claim 14 further comprising:

means for identifying one or more of the selected employees with a high contribution level and a high attrition risk;

means for displaying the identified employees to the user;

means for determining whether to provide incentives to one or more of the identified employees; and

means for revising incentive planning data corresponding to one or more of the identified employees in response to the determination.

**J. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

Not applicable.

**K. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

Not applicable.